

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim 4 has been amended to depend on claim 3. No substantive claim amendment has been made. It is respectfully submitted that claim 13 recites "a method as recited in claim 12" and claim 53 properly refers to a "determining (e)." Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner should withdraw the objection to claims 13 and 53. The Examiner's rejection of the claims is fully traversed below.

Initially, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's rejection is improper because it is based on U.S. Publication Number 2003/0061401 A1 (*Atwal et al.*) and U.S. Publication Number 2003/0074579 A1 (*Della-Libera et al.*) which respectively have the filing dates of September 23, 2003 and February 6, 2002 (both after the filing date of the above-identified application). Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner should withdraw the rejection of the claims.

It is noted that *Atwal et al.* and *Della-Libera et al.* have a corresponding provisional applications. However, it should also be noted that the 35 U.S.C. 102(e) date of a reference that did not result from, nor claimed the benefit of, an international application is its earliest effective U.S. filing date, taking into consideration any proper benefit claims to prior U.S. applications under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) or 120 if the prior application(s) properly supports the subject matter used to make the rejection in compliance with 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph as outlined in MPEP §2136.02 (see, MPEP 706.02(f)(1), Examination Guidelines for applying references under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)). In this case, the Examiner has NOT properly supported the rejection based on the provisional applications. In fact, the Examiner's rejection does NOT even make a reference to the provisional applications or even make a general allegation that the provisional applications properly support the Examiner's rejection. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's rejection is clearly improper and should be withdrawn.

Rejection of claims 1-3, 5, 13, 23-66 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

Nevertheless, solely in order to expedite the prosecution, the Applicant will address the provisional applications. It is noted that the provisional application 60/324,191 associated with *Atwal et al.* states:

Since the Web services Infrastructure is listening to all SOAP communication between client and service, the Web Services Infrastructure has the information to determine what methods are being called, under what conditions and even by whom, provided that identification information was given by the caller. The Web Services Infrastructure is able to check authentication, authorization, and billing information and determine if the method call should be allowed to proceed to the service. When the response from the service returns, the Web Services Infrastructure is then able to update any relevant billing or audit information. In general the Web Services Infrastructure can perform all infrastructure functions common to the related web services because the Web Services Infrastructure is privy to all of the information passed from client to service (line 31, page 9 to line 6, page 10 of the Provisional Application No. 60/324,191).

It is respectfully submitted that a Web Services Infrastructure that has the information to determine what methods are being called, under what condition the methods are being called, and even by whom the methods are called does NOT teach or even remotely suggest: determining whether a security rule is associated with a SOAP message, wherein the security rule is associated with a security policy for exchanging messages between a client program and a server program (claim 1). Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that the provisional application 60/324,191 does NOT teach or suggest this feature. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that the Web Services Infrastructure described above does NOT teach or even remotely suggest performing an operation based on the security rule when it is determined that a security rule is associated with a SOAP message.

Further, it is respectfully submitted that the Web Service Infrastructure described above does NOT teach or even remotely suggest: a security rule that describes a mapping between one or more keys respectively used by a client and a server program (claim 2). Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that the provisional application 60/324,191 does NOT teach or suggest this feature.

Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that the Web Service Infrastructure described above does NOT teach or even remotely suggest: mapping one or more security identifiers which are recognized by a client program to one or more security identifiers which are recognized by the server program (claim 3). Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that the provisional application 60/324,191 does NOT teach or suggest this feature.

Rejection of claims 4, 6-14, 16-21, 26 and 36 under U.S.C. 103(a)

Initially, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's rejection is clearly improper because the Examiner has not even made a general allegation that the provisional application No. 60/329,796 associated with *Della-Libera et al.* supports the Examiner's rejection which is based on the assertion that serious deficiencies of *Atwal et al.* can be cured by *Della-Libera et al.* (Office Action, page 14).

Furthermore, it is earnestly believed that application No. 10/068,444 does NOT teach or suggest the combination of the features recited, for example, in claim 16.


Still further, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of the provisional applications do NOT teach or suggest: mapping one or more encryption keys, decryption keys, signing keys, or keys used to verify one or more signatures between a client program and a server program (claim 4).

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, it is submitted that all pending claims are patentably distinct over the cited art of record. Additional limitations recited in the independent claims or the dependent claims are not further discussed because the limitations discussed above are sufficient to distinguish the claimed invention from the cited art. Accordingly, Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner.

Applicants hereby petition for an extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee for such extension or any further fee required in connection with the filing of this Amendment is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 500388 (Order No. STELP002). Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP


R. Mahboubian
Reg. No. 44,890

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(650) 961-8300

STELP002

18 of 18